

Appln No. 10/758,559  
Navy Case No. 96,046  
Amendment in Reply to Final Office action dated Dec. 6, 2005

**AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS**

The replacement sheet containing FIG. 1 and FIG. 2, appended hereto, includes a change in FIG. 1.

In FIG. 1, reference numeral 31, added via applicant's amendment filed 17 November 2005, has been removed.

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is responsive to the final Office Action mail dated 6 December 2005 having a three-month period for response ending 6 March 2006.

The final Office Action allowed claims 1-5, rejected new claim 16 under 35 USC 103 and 35 USC 112, and objected to the specification and drawings under 35 USC 132(a) because of alleged "new matter" added by applicant's amendment filed 17 November 2005.

Applicant's attorney wishes to thank examiner Barry for the courtesy extended during the 13 February 2006 telephone interview wherein the outstanding Office Action was discussed and clarified. Specifically, the examiner clarified that the objection to the specification in numbered paragraph 2 on page 5 of the Office Action was directed to a previous amendment to paragraph [0012] instead of the cited paragraph [0031] in view of the fact that the application does not contain a paragraph [0031]. The examiner also clarified that the language objected to in numbered paragraph 3 on page 5 of the Office Action and appearing in paragraph [0009] of the application is the phrase "for example" newly added to paragraph [0009] and not the phrase "such as" cited in the Office Action. Further, the examiner clarified that the objection to the drawings entailed reference numeral 31 newly added to Fig. 1.

Claims 1-5 stand allowed.

On pages 3 and 4, the examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 USC 103 and 112. In response, applicant has cancelled claim 16 which should remove these grounds for rejection.

In paragraph numbered 1 on page 4 of the Office Action, the examiner objected to the term “such as” added to paragraph [0005]. In response, the present amendment has removed the phrase “fluent biomass such as” which should remove this ground for objection.

In paragraph numbered 2 on page 5 of the Office Action, the examiner objected to the term “by means of a control 31” appearing, as clarified during the interview, in paragraph [0012]. In response, applicant has amended paragraph [0012] by deleting the phrase “by means of a control 31 as diagrammed in FIG.1” which should remove this ground for objection.

In paragraph numbered 3 on page 5 of the Office Action, the examiner objected to language added to paragraph [0009] clarified during the interview to be the phrase “for example”. In response, applicant has deleted the phrase “for example” in paragraph [0009] which should remove this ground for objection.

Drawing Fig. 1 has been amended to delete reference numeral 31 which the examiner clarified as the grounds for the objection to the drawings. A replacement sheet of drawings containing Figs 1 and 2 is being filed along with this Amendment.

Appln No. 10/758,559  
Navy Case No. 96,046  
Amendment in Reply to Final Office action dated Dec. 6, 2005

The forgoing amendments are believed to place the application fully in allowable form. Since the amendments to the application comprise deletions of language objected to by the examiner and the cancellation of a rejected claim, entry of this amendment appears to be in order. Accordingly, entry of this amendment and the early issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John Forrest', is written over the printed name.

JOHN FORREST, Reg. No. 29,378  
Attorney for Applicant

Tele: 301 227-1835  
OFFICE OF COUNSEL CODE 004  
NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER  
CARDEROCK DIVISION HEADQUARTERS  
DAVID TAYLOR MODEL BASIN  
9500 MACARTHUR BOULEVARD  
WEST BETHESDA, MD 20817-5700